

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 06918 813 2

F70
.A2

No. F70.A2



GIVEN BY

Cincinnati Public Library

Boston Public Library

Do not write in this book or mark it with pen or pencil. Penalties for so doing are imposed by the Revised Laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

This book was issued to the borrower on the date last stamped below.



Gift of Dr S. J. Green

AN APPEAL

TO THE

MECHANICS AND LABORING-MEN

OF

NEW ENGLAND,

DELIVERED AT FALL RIVER, NOV. 5, 1870,

BY

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.



4637

BOSTON :

PRINTED BY RAND, AVERY, & FRYE.

1870.

AN APPEAL

TO THE

MECHANICS AND LABORING-MEN

OF

NEW ENGLAND,

DELIVERED AT FALL RIVER, NOV. 5, 1870,

BY

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.



BOSTON:
PRINTED BY RAND, AVERY, & FRYE.
1870.

F70

.A2

Cincinnati Public Library
July 2, 1948

273411

5/I/49 nb

SPEECH OF JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

MY FELLOW-CITIZENS, — It is my purpose this evening to discuss with you some of the questions of interest which are suggested by the approaching election. I shall attempt no rhetoric or declamation to distract your calm attention from plain facts. I shall endeavor to abstain from abuse of persons who differ from me in opinion. I am ready to acknowledge, if you like, that either Mr. Claflin or Mr. Phillips would make a better governor than I could make you. Those matters do not interest me, nor, in fact, you ; for in truth it is a matter of very small moment what man, so long as he is a decent citizen, fills the chair at the head of the council-table. But, my friends, it is of great moment who is elected, if he represents any worthy ideas. The present incumbent is claimed by his friends to represent all the morals, respectability, wealth, and decency in the State ; and on that ground substantially his party demand his re-election. I do not care to dispute the eminent gravity and respectability of him and his retainers ; but I shall try to the best of a very poor ability to show you that your true interests will guide you to vote the Democratic ticket, because that ticket to-day, more than any other, represents fair dealing, impartial legislation, and a truer liberty ; for the usurpation of a majority

is an infringement of the principle of free government as much as the edict of a Cæsar. Without any further preface, I will plunge into my subject by a truism. Happiness is the end of government; and to find out the best way to secure it by law is the object of politics. Speaking generally, there are two great natural divisions of sentiment among men upon all questions of government. There are the much-government men and the little-government men; those who think that government can create and bestow positive blessings, and those who think that it can at most only prevent evil; those who hold that government can procure, and those who aver that it can only secure, public happiness. In a word, one set of men regard the great majority of men as incapable of discerning or pursuing their own happiness without the guidance and control of some part of their fellow-citizens, called a government; while the other set think that each individual is the best judge, and surest artificer, of his own welfare. One party is naturally for the unwearyed activity, the other for the masterly inactivity, of government. Now, from the beginning of things, before the Constitution was adopted, these two great natural parties have struggled, with various fortune, in our public affairs. The governmental party thought the Constitution too weak to stand. As Alexander Hamilton, the great leader of the strong-government faction, said, "I am still laboring to prop the frail and useless fabric. There must be persevering endeavor to establish the fortune of a great empire on foundations much firmer than have yet been devised;" while the let-us-alone party feared that it held a despotism in its belly. Thomas Jefferson, the first great advo-

cate in America of the "hands-off" theory, objected to it; "The omission of a bill of rights providing clearly, and without the aid of sophism, for freedom of religion, freedom of the press, protection against standing armies, restriction of monopolies, the eternal and unremitting force of the *habeas corpus*, and trial by jury." The burnt child dreads the fire; and our fathers had not fought the imperial parliament of Great Britain so long, only to set up a new parliament of their own to domineer and direct them; so these justly jealous and nobly suspicious freemen did not rest easy until they added to their grant of powers to a common fund for the general protection these words, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." They dreaded even then the grasping of ungranted powers and the usurpation of doubtful functions by Congress, until the central creature should dragoon its scattered creators. Alexander Hamilton represents the much-government sentiment, which always dreads and anticipates the aggression of numbers upon property; to prevent which is, in their eyes, the great end of government. His policy was to supply by construction all the prerogatives which the Constitution denied to the United States. In his artful hands, the plastic powers of the simple act of federation swelled into portentous proportions. Its flaccid muscles were strung like wires. His system contemplated a great army, a pompous ceremonial parade, the erection of manufactures by government "protection," a great banking establishment directed by the central power of government, and, in short, an im-

posing and expensive machine to manage the people's affairs for them as much as possible. Thomas Jefferson stands for the democratic idea in this country as well to-day as he did seventy-five years ago. Now, he urged that the people gave in the Constitution such powers only as were expressly specified, and no presumption was admissible against the people. If reasonable doubt arose whether the exercise of any function was conceded to Congress, the people were entitled to the benefit of the doubt; for Congress was an agent of strictly limited powers, and incapable of assuming by indirection duties not delegated. Thus he wanted no army, very little navy; and he eschewed the formal etiquette and ceremonial which Gen. Washington had introduced. He thought that the people never gave Congress the power to regulate the industry of the country, or intended to embark the public funds in a banking enterprise; and he abhorred taxation and paper money. Simplicity and frugality were the only ornaments of his government. The contrast in the central ideas of the two men is crisp and stringent. Just as crisp and just as stringent must the opposition of the two elemental parties in government always be, if you will patiently pursue it to its final analysis. Hamilton instinctively identified all his hopes with government. Jefferson relied entirely upon the people; and, confiding frankly in their virtue and self-control, he regarded governments at best as a necessary evil. Hamilton's Eutopia would have been a perfectly magnificent, perfectly wise, and all-powerful government, of the best, doing all things for all men perfectly well; while Jefferson dreamed of the happy consummation when men

would dwell together in harmony and good-will, without tax-gatherer or constable to make them afraid. These grand divisions of opinion are fundamental, and, of course, permanent. They have persistently cloven the public opinion of the inhabitants of the United States from the first ; and they will continue to do so to the last : their battle-ground alone changes. It is not surprising, therefore, to find the old debate breaking out afresh on almost every page of our political annals. To-day, in this election, the old identical issues are on trial. The means which Gen. Hamilton employed are those which men of minds like him must always use in the United States to centralize power ; for the Constitution was intended to reduce the central government to the lowest terms consistent with an effectual Union, and any party which would exercise general and plenary powers must strain or burst its barriers to do so. In those days, the States were jealous rivals of the General Government ; and the convergent school of statecraft regarded them very much as feudal sovereigns used to regard their powerful and pugnacious barons. As one of the leaders in that persuasion, and intimate friend of the leader of it (Gouverneur Morris), said, "State attachments and State importance have been the bane of this country. We cannot annihilate them ; but we may perhaps take out the teeth of the serpents." Mr. Jefferson, on the contrary, in the Kentucky and Virginia resolution of 1798, deplored and deprecated the "spirit manifested by the Federal Government to enlarge its powers by forced constructions, and so as to consolidate the States, by degrees, into one sovereignty ; the inevitable result of which

would be to transform the present republican system of the United States into an absolute, or, at best, a mixed monarchy." And upon this issue, my friends, the great contest of 1800, between the Federalists and the Democrats, was tried; and from the absolute and utter overthrow which they then experienced, Federalism, in the form of the Federal party, never recovered. But to-day it re-appears as the Republican party, and offers precisely the same issues to the people. But Hamilton lacked, although he longed for, the blessing accorded to his latter-day followers. The civil war of secession furnished a natural, if not a necessary means for humbling the pride of the States, and establishing a vast and well-built edifice of central force and power at Washington. Reconstruction was substantially an entire subordination of the disaffected States to the Congress of the United States; and as Mr. Morton, one of the ablest of the Senate, very justly urged recently, in debate upon the case of the restive reconstructed State of Georgia, there can be no sacred unction in the mere act of admission of representatives to Congress, which, under any constitutional construction which authorized reconstruction, can irrevocably bar fresh and further reconstruction. It is clear that precisely the same power which can keep out the representatives of a State from Congress, until it shall enact a constitution which a majority of that body may think republican in form, may turn out of Congress the representatives of that State, if, at any time, its constitution shall cease to satisfy the majority in that regard. Consequently, the power of Congress is as supreme to-day over those States as ever it was; for it was the

ultima ratio, the, "I can" and the "I will," and no other power, which placed them at its feet. Cicero said, that "victory made all the sacred things of the Syracusans profane." The sacred rights of the States our conquest made profane. But, although he lacked the autocracy which the civil war has conferred on his disciples of our generation, Hamilton used vigorously what he had. He established, first, a huge funding system; and, by assuming the debts of the States, he centred in the central establishment the regards of all the public creditors. He set up a government bank, and thus he rallied about him all the vast moneyed interests of the country; and with magnificent ability and persuasive eloquence, he urged upon Congress the policy of encouraging domestic industry by "protection." No friend of our present tariff need trouble himself to go further than Hamilton's works in the Congressional Library, and turn to the Report on Manufactures, to arm himself with every weapon which has yet been found to maintain the protective policy which he loves. Every device of to-day is there, protecting duties, prohibitory imposts, bounties, premiums, exemption of raw materials, drawbacks, facilitating transportation by roads and canals, and specific aid by the General Government, — all are there as unfaded as the colors at Pompeii. To be sure, even Mr. Hamilton doubted the power of the National Government to give "State aid" to roads and canals; but in that respect we have bravely outgrown his scruples.

Now we lavish the priceless patrimony of the poor people in reckless grants of provinces and empires at a breath upon cormorant corporations. The ulti-

mate idea of all this federal republican system is simply this: Government knows better than the people the way to happiness. Do you simpletons wish to farm? Why, don't you know that farmers are seldom very wealthy, and to be happy one must be rich? Spin, you fool! spin. You won't? Then I will tax you, and pay your tax to the spinner, till you see light. And what is that you say? You want to buy your clothes and blankets in England? Why? you ignorant fool! why? Because they are twice as good, and half as dear. You sha'n't do it: it is disloyal: you must buy of your own countrymen. But you can't afford to? Why, then, go make pig-iron, and get rich. Or do you plead that your training and inclination urges you to go down to the sea in ships as your New-England fathers did before you, and greatly prospered? do you point to the customs returns, which prove, that, ten years ago, we had three-fourths of all our foreign shipping built, manned, and sailed by American citizens, while to-day we possess but two-fifths of it, and earn but thirty-five millions of freight, instead of the sixty millions we then enjoyed, the balance going now to foreigners, all the satisfaction we receive is, "Oh, go and boil salt, and the people shall pay you one hundred per cent." And so with coal, and every thing we wear or use. All must be bought where Congress pleases, and not where the consumer wishes; and he must work at what Congress orders, because thus alone can the pure and unadulterated happiness of protection be realized. And, let free-traders scoff as they may, there is a profound philosophy in this system. In the first place, it has been the system in general use in the world from the creation down; and,

secondly, it is very pleasant—to *the protected*. Who shall say that life is not more enjoyable (or used to be) in Paris, for instance, where every step was made smooth and safe by government, than in rough New York, or even moral Boston—to *the well off*? To be sure, the people pay, and are always poor; but it is pleasant to have a soldier or a semi-soldier to guard you, and an official to call your cab, or lead you to your compartment. No one who has tried it will deny that a paternal government is a pleasant government for the rich, provided you and the paternal agree; but, if you disagree, your happiness is marred. But then you ought not to disagree; that's all. No American need turn up his nose with the old democratic pride at this disloyal talk nowadays; for, if the principle of protection is not the backbone of paternal government, you will search in vain for that necessary article in its costly framework. The difference is in degree, not in kind. Mr. Jefferson and his followers have always stoutly maintained, on the other hand, that, while they were willing to pay all taxes necessary to secure immunity from domestic or foreign violence, they were not willing that their hard-earned dollars should be handed over, not to the treasury, but to the favored trader. Protection and aid from government they should have none of; for why should an American need any protection or any aid? He was able and willing to paddle his own canoe. He never put Congress there for any such purpose. He knew far better than any Congress how to manage his business, and where to buy his goods. He had a right to do as he pleased, provided he did not invade his neighbor's equal rights. And, as for

this claim of Congress to meddle endlessly in his affairs, he never gave them any such authority. That Constitution he never agreed to.

And so with the currency juggle. If you ask us why legal tender was unlawful, I tell you frankly that we hate it because it was a usurpation, and a very mean usurpation, — the usurpation of a fraud. Why, there are hundreds of instances in history where, the moment the “strong governments” of the old times got into difficulty, their arbitrary and swindling old kings at once debased their coin, and so cheated their people out of twenty, thirty, fifty per cent of their claims, as the case might be. It is a flagrant restriction of natural right, and a plain infringement of fundamental law. In like manner, the Democratic party denounce the national bank-system as an extravagant and an odious monopoly, at war with its fundamental jealousy of accretion of powers. The banking power and its allies have been able within the year to neutralize the whole influence of the government, and to snub Mr. Boutwell cruelly in his utmost pride of place; and no truly democratic policy could tolerate such a connection. The money-power of a nation rules it too much for a Democrat even, when it is held at arm’s-length from Washington; but weld it into your government, and liberty is held by sufferance alone. So says the Jackson Democrat; and he says so logically and well. If it be best to let us alone, then every man who wishes to engage in banking should be at liberty to do so so long as he redeems his bills promptly in specie. Free banking, and redemption at sight, in gold, is the true faith for them that ponder the words of Andrew Jackson. And with what patience

can a Democrat listen to the hungry corporations, which, like the sharks around a dead whale in the South Seas, turn up their wicked white bellies every now and again to snatch a huge mouthful of blubber from the helpless carcass. Who gave you, demands the Democrat of the Legislature, — who gave you a right to take my money, and invest it for me in Berdell bonds, or what not? Who gave you permission to sink my money in a foolish hole in Hoosac Hill? I came into your society for mutual protection. I agreed, that so much of my sweat as you needed for the necessities common to us all, — such as justice, charity, and even education, — you might take; but I never agreed that my labor, which is my liberty and my life, should be given by you to any private enterprise you may favor. I retain that liberty. I recognize no necessity here. I prefer to invest my earnings for myself. If a majority of my fellow-citizens may vote my property into a railroad speculation, they may entangle me in a cotton-mill, or smother me in a woollen speculation, or drown me in a distillery job. The principle once admitted, that the public money may be applied with other than the sternest fidelity to limited functions of strictly general application, and the day is not distant when scoundrels fatten on the sweat of the toiling people. Gentlemen, look at your State treasury. Your excellent governor told you last January that you owed thirty-five millions of dollars; and of that, fifteen millions was sunk in the Hartford and Erie swindle, and buried in the Hoosac hole. And he tells you, “Experience shows us that a project once commenced under the patronage of the State has to be still further sustained, or

large losses are almost sure to accrue to the Commonwealth." Of course they do, just as losses usually accrue to silly people who meddle in what is none of their business. Nor can the party of anti-monopolists endure to see the public domain, which seemed given, as by a special providence, to endow a population of democrats, each man free and equal on his own free farm, freely seeking his own happiness in his own way, unhampered by government, and untrammelled by rent, sliced off in huge masses, and handed to voracious corporations.

From this hasty review, my friends, you can judge of the guiding spirit which animates the opposing parties to-day, from history, and from observation of their present acts. The Republican points to reconstruction, which is military force; to "protection," which is forcible monopoly; to the national banks, which are a bribe of thirty millions of dollars annually to the monetary connection to support the Republican party, paid by the people; to land-grants, as large as France and Prussia, given outright from the people's homestead to a railway ring; and say, "There is our record: judge of its spirit." And I do judge of it, and I say in all honesty, that it seems to me to be distorted by the same spirit of arbitrary greediness which we have been accustomed to expect in old times from the old system, which regarded only the interests of the more wealthy and powerful in commercial and fiscal regulations. It seems to me that a meddlesome force is the secret of it. I think Congress intends to confer the congressional conception of happiness upon a reluctant people. Shall they?

The Democratic party, on the other hand, opposes

all these measures, and many more like unto them, on two grounds mainly: 1. That, by such an assumption and aggregation of power, the central government is growing too great and unwieldy for a federal democratic system; and, 2, that the true interest of the vast body of any people is to reserve to the individual the greatest possible freedom from restraint, either in his business or pleasures, compatible with order. As an eloquent and able Republican friend puts it for me, "The true Democrat is the man who governs himself, and respects the rights of others; asking no favor, and claiming no privilege." The Democratic tariff, as Mr. Horace Greeley puts it for me, is, "No duty except for revenue, and the highest rate that will put most money in the treasury." One party would guide the people; the other lets them guide themselves. Now, let us take the parties in this State, and class them according to our great fundamental division; for you will find, if you will examine it, that there is always an inevitable tendency in parties to reduce themselves to two only. To that complexion our politics will come in a short time. Take first the Republican party. Of course, so far as the bulk and management of the Republican party is concerned, there can be nothing but open war between us, for the reason that the essential principle of its policy is force, and the essence of its power is a supra-constitutional arrogation of authority. Reconstruction is war-power; the tariff is forcible monopoly; the banks are money-power. The monopolists are, in fact, the party. The revenue reformers are a proscribed and powerless minority; to them we hold out a hand, and with them we cordially

sympathize. To the men who are fighting in Missouri the battle of freedom and equal rights in behalf of the disfranchised white men of the South, we send a hearty God-speed.

My friends, we are with all who are struggling to remove the shackles of government, and leave men free to seek their own happiness. The Republican party is nothing but Hamiltonian-Federalism, with Sumner instead of Hamilton for its prophet; and, between free democracy and his dictatorial and aristocratic notions, no peace, nor truce, nor least momentary pause of war, is possible; but war,—eternal and unremitting war to the knife.

Next we come to the revolted wing of the Republicans,—the prohibitory party. How do we stand as regards the prohibitionists? Why, there can be very little doubt where they belong, if we consider their guiding principle. What is it?—to abolish intemperance, not by moral culture, but by force. That is strictly prohibition in the only department we care about,—the political one. The political attitude of that party is the law concerning the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor known as the prohibitory law. That law was designed to prevent by force the sale of liquor in this Commonwealth. It is not true that it is aimed against tippling-shops only or mainly: it would, if enforced, exhaust every constitutional expedient to prevent the sale of any liquor to any one to drink in this State. That, I say, was its design, and would be its legitimate effect. It is now not a prohibitory law in any sense: it is “free rum,” so far as cider and malt go, and a license law as to spirits; the state constables being the board of license.

Now, it has been a favorite charge against us, that we were "rummies;" and it was a pleasing parody upon a cry somewhat used by us at one time that we were for "Adams and free rum." It is rather a curious circumstance, by the way, that this party of double-distilled conscience and adamantine temperance should have been, upon the whole, the most unfair and the least decent, in their political methods of discussion of any we ever had. I need not tell you that the allegation was false, for you will presume as much from its origin; but I will add, that we claim to deplore the evil of intemperance, and to desire its mitigation as honestly as the arrogant faction which assumes to possess the only right to advocate temperance for all but themselves. But we say, that, while we love temperance, we cannot stultify ourselves by ignoring human nature, or wrong our neighbor by assailing his liberty. The denunciation of the sale can have no possible object but the prevention of the purchase, and, by depriving the purchaser of the means of excess, prevent him, by force, from exceeding. Now, the Democratic party has always said, that, as men were constituted, the appetite for some stimulants in that kind was as universal, and as capable of innocent gratification, as any natural appetite. This is amply proved by the invariable experience of wine countries. That it is impossible to prevent its gratification, the history of the law has amply shown. For fifteen years, it has tried and failed; for fifteen years, its only effect has been to make the poor man's tipples dear and vile, while the rich sold or drank at his ease. Like all such laws, it drove the persecuted trader into darkness and the slums, and, by a neces-

sary consequence, aggravated the evil of his business. We said it is best to accept the inevitable, and recognize what it is impossible to repress. Further: we would not annihilate it if we could. We would have all temperate, but compel none to be totally abstinent; for we have ever believed that an enforced abstinence is an assault on true temperance. The forced abstainer is a drunkard still; for temperance, my friends, is disciplined self-respect and a strengthened self-restraint, — a moral power gained and augmented by exercise only, just as surely as the muscle of the athlete is hardened by training. I should regard it as a wrong to real temperance to exclude, if I could, every drop of intoxicating drink from the Commonwealth. We say that the law has not and cannot reduce intemperance and crime; that it can never be enforced; that its ideal execution would be a treason to true temperance. In short, the Democratic party admits that men will drink, and drink to excess; and that, inasmuch as it is true that the propensity is productive of pauperism or crime, we will protect the community from loss by making those who drink pay for the additional police service, and the maintenance of the victims of excess. We propose to levy a tax of a million of dollars upon the consumer of intoxicating liquor to indemnify the State for any possible loss; but as to this favorite apology of our fanatical friends, that maintains the law, — because by it master-mechanics can get more work out of their hands, — we repudiate it altogether. The workman has just the same right to get drunk that his master has, and no more. Society must pay something for liberty, as man must achieve the conquest of himself by painful struggles;

and it is better to accept the suffering and death of some from excess than it is to turn our good old Commonwealth into one great reformatory inebriate-asylum, on the compulsory plan, for all of its citizens. Thinking thus, we must be utterly and irreconcilably opposed to the prohibitory party. It belongs in its spirit and principle to the party of force; it breathes nothing of our aspiration for a larger liberty; it relies on government for its reforms, and looks for happiness by statute; it begins with the machine, we cherish the man; its divorce from its natural affinity, and true and only love, is but temporary, — a lover's quarrel; its present connection is but little to its mind.

Well might the brilliant candidate of the piebald party exclaim, "Politics, like misery, makes queer bed-fellows;" for the labor reformers have no more affiliation with the prohibitory parsons than Theodore Parker with a hell-fire Calvinist; the labor reformers are natural democrats. Their vital interests compel them to adhere to the party which advocates the principles which I have reviewed of democratic liberty. No class suffers so much from class-legislation; none prospers as they do by liberty. The system of taxation under which they groan is of Republican origin and institution; and it has been handed down from Hamilton to Clay, and from Clay to Schenck. Mr. Hamilton got it, as he got all his cumbersome machinery, from England. And who made the laws regulating trade in England? Why, Adam Smith tells you who there made these laws, — "Merchants and manufacturers were the original inventors of these restraints upon the importation of foreign

goods, which secure to them the monopoly of the home-market." Why, it is notorious that the operative had no more influence in Parliament, a hundred years ago, nay, not so much, as a bullock. And France had had a protective "tariff" for two hundred years before that. Now, who obtained that "protection"? in whose interest was it devised? It was very like ours, but not quite so bad; and who feathered their nests by that? The workingmen? Why, my friends, the workingman was of less consideration in those days than a working-horse. The king made the laws; and what do you suppose the king cared for such "canaille"? No: the same hands wrote, and the same heads schemed, and the same purses profited by "protection" then, as do now,—the great manufacturing speculators. But even those it does not benefit in the long-run. It is suicidal, even to the greedy maw which craves it. Just look at the official figures. Ten years ago, your great cotton-mills were prosperous; yet they were competing, aye, gentlemen, and successfully competing, in the markets of the world with all the pauper or other labor in the universe. Ten years ago, they exported for sale eleven million (gold) dollars' worth of their fabrics, and they paid handsome dividends. To-day, the export has fallen to three millions seven hundred thousand (in currency); and dividends are paid out of savings, not earnings. Or look at our great leather industry. I am told by prominent men in that trade that their traffic is slow and dull, and profits small. Why is it? Why, my friends, the tariff has crippled it. Look again at the exports. In 1860, they exported for sale \$1,547,177 (gold) of boots, shoes, and

saddlery; and they needed no protection to face the labor of all the world, and prosper enormously. Now, the export has fallen to \$673,333 (currency); and business languishes more and more. Or see your copper-mines, which, years ago, insisted that they, too, have "protection." Perhaps they were forced to it; for "protection" strangles all except the favored few, —and these, too, sometimes. Ten years ago, the mines were prosperous; and of copper and brass manufactures we exported \$1,664,000 (gold). Now, we send away but a million (currency). No, my friends, not all, even of manufactures, profit by protection; and the great shipping interest of New England is long ago in dust: but do laboring men profit? If they do, their gain comes from a very unlikely and suspicious quarter; if they do, it must be misadventure which twists the devices of old time and despotic riches to aid and enrich the poor; if they do, then it is unaccountable how steadily beneath this policy the merchants and manufacturers have, for five hundred years, grown richer and more powerful, and the workmen poorer. There is no mistake, however, about it. The machine works just as its crafty old inventors intended; and so it will work till the workmen smash it. Why, look at it. The whole labor of the American people is estimated, by competent authority, to be to-day represented by a capitalized accumulation not exceeding twenty-four thousand millions of dollars; while the gross annual product of labor is seven thousand millions: so that we produce as the annual result of labor nearly one-third, and some excellent authorities fix it as high as one-half, in value of all the property in the United States, so little compara-

tively is saved and stored away, and so greatly does time and moth and rust consume the deposit. While labor performs this miracle of reproducing the whole valuation of the whole people in two or three years, it is manifest how small a deviation from a fair division will divert a large share from the millions of workmen into the piles of the few shrewd managers. "And how slight a change," as Mr. Commissioner Wells states it, "in the distribution of the net annual profit may make to the masses all the difference that exists between abundance and deficiency, advancement and retrogression!" You have seven thousand millions result to share; and the capital consumed in earning it claims justly to be replaced with ten per cent interest. Very well. Then steps in "protection," and says you must pay out of the common fund forty per cent at least, on an average, upon the value produced by the favored industries (say a thousand millions of dollars only) to them. That will be four hundred millions of dollars. Now, Mr. Wells tells us, that the whole annual surplus of production over expenditure is only \$546,000,000.

We find our tariff, therefore, taking a sum nearly equal to the entire savings of the country out of the common pool, and handing it over bodily to a small faction of favored capitalists. Now, what should we expect to find, from the parentage and history as well as the methods of this system, would be its practical result to the workmen, if I am correct? Why, we should look to find the workman distressed and uneasy, without knowing exactly what hurts him; for the process is cunning. Well, what does the United-States commissioner, appointed by Congress, report,

after years of conscientious toil? "During the last few years, the manifestations of discontent, on the part of the real producing classes, against what has seemed to them to be the encroachments and oppressions of capital, have rapidly increased in number and significance. The wonder is, not that labor should instinctively cry out, and blindly accuse capital, but, rather, that the outburst of remonstrance has not been more violent and menacing."

Laboring men, if there be any present, believe me, that your true remedy is not in strikes, nor in piling laws on laws. The crafty schemers who work the political puppets are shrewd, united, educated, and wealthy; and they always will, as they always have, beat you to death on their favorite battle-ground,—the halls of legislation. You are poor and busy and scattered, and, in many cases, ill educated. If you try to fight the monopolists alone, you will be ignominiously beaten; nay, more, you will retard the triumph of the very principle which alone you need,—the principle of freedom of trade, and fair division of profits, which can only be reached by the "hands off" of Democracy. Sooner or later, you must join the party of anti-monopoly; for monopoly is your bane, not capital: sooner or later, you must fight our foes, for they are yours also. Our true interests are identical; why, then, peril them by unconcerted action? The Chinese have taught you the falsehood of the simple pretence that "protection" protects the laborer; and that service alone will go far to reconcile me to their unwelcome invasion. And permit me, my friends, a word, before I close, upon this small matter which has caused a great talk. I call it small, be-

cause, as yet, the whole immigration is not much over a hundred thousand. Its tail is long enough. I am frequently asked my opinion on this Chinese question; and I may as well dispose of it here and now. I should be glad to know that never another "heathen Chineé" set his foot on our soil. According to my notion, no State is the better for herds of such "dull, driven cattle." There are two ways of looking at these questions of national development: one is that which regards only the money-side, and asks only how can we soonest grow rich; the other, how we can best erect the grandest State. One declares the first object to be the making of money; the other, the rearing of men. For myself, I have always held, with Oliver Goldsmith, —

" Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay."

And, as for the Chinese, I like not the breed. To my mind, we have a sufficiently puzzling race-problem on our hands here to solve already, without adding to it this element of moral mummyhood deposited by ten hundred years of stagnation.

My friends, I watch and wait for the coming of the day when all who long for reform, whether it be in labor, in revenue, in civil service, or in the constitutional habits of government, shall be found marching shoulder to shoulder under the old Democratic flag; and then I shall be only too glad to resign my present post to some good and true man, who shall lead you on to the relief of excessive labor, the reduction of excessive taxation, and the establishment of the largest possible liberty under the least possible government.



Boston Public Library
Central Library, Copley Square

Division of
Reference and Research Services

The Date Due Card in the pocket indicates the date on or before which this book should be returned to the Library.

Please do not remove cards from this pocket.



